WILSHIRE'S

"LET THE NATION OWN THE TRUSTS"

GAYLORD WILSHIRE
Editor

Vol. XV. No. 7 NEW YORK, JULY, 1911 Price, 5 Cents per Copy

The Coronation of King George V.

IF any of my readers may have thought that since I was in England during the Coronation that, therefore, I would be able to give a first-hand account of the show they will be disappointed. I fled London two days before the event and will not return till two days after it is all over.

This doesn't mean that I am such a stout republican that I wish to discourage further coronations by marking them with my disapproval by my absence. Not at all; I think any great free show that amuses the multitude just so much to the good in these dull gray times. However, in my own case the interest was hardly strong enough to induce me to get up at four o'clock in the morning in order to be sure of paying $25 for a seat and there to sit for five mortal hours waiting for King George to drive by.

If I had never seen Barnum's circus parade I think I might have made this much exertion. Elephants and camels and such like walking through the streets still have a great fascination, but mere men only distinguished by being sons of their fathers, well, no four A. M. for that.

And after all, what is the coronation to attract all this notice? There must be some significance in this gathering of the wealth of the world in London to see the crowning of a king who not only has no more power after the ceremony than before, but of a king that has no power anyway. The English king is but a mere figure-head.

The significance of the coronation is purely social, exactly as our horse show is the great event of the year, and an event far transcending the inauguration of a mere president.

The coronation is the great fashionable event of the international season and has no more political significance to the fashionables than a Bradley Martin ball. This don't mean the day of kings is passing, for it is not, or at any rate not rapidly.

There are two reasons among many making for the life of kings. First, the growing concentration of capital and its accompanying autocratic cast finds its natural reflex in a king. A republic of to-day is representative of the old-time competitive days of democratic industry, and as that type of industry is passing that sort of a republic is also passing. While Taft is called President, nevertheless he exerts far more power both executively and legislatively than any potentate in Europe or any prime minister for that matter and, moreover, it is an irresponsible power, and to all intents and purposes he is even more than a king.

The constitution never contemplated that the president would develop into such an autocrat, but on the other hand the constitution never thought of a railway trust, for there were no railways when the constitution was written.

It was especially arranged by our forefathers that the president should not influence legislation and yet the presidents of to-day are coming to be almost the whole thing as to legislation. Look how Taft advocated and worked for the Canadian reciprocity matter and how he practically forces both houses to obey his will. I am not criticising him for this or saying that it's a bad thing. As a matter of fact I think it a much better thing that we have one man legislate for us whom we know and to that extent can make morally responsible, than it is to have a horde of unknown and irresponsible grafters log-roll bills through a Congress.

As long as we have a Morgan in finance we naturally must expect to see a Taft president, and we are lucky to have as good a man as Taft. Not that he is anything to be especially proud about. His letter at the time of the Warren pardon disclosed a far weaker man than I had thought, weaker and smaller. However, he is not so bad as Teddy.

In Europe there was a marked movement toward republicanism some thirty or forty years ago, but it has all died out. It has been crushed between Socialism on the one hand and the concentration of capital on the other.

The workers see that there is no use of wasting their energies attacking the feudal kings who have little or no power, when the industrial kings, who have a great and growing power, are the real enemies.

(*Continued on page* 3.)

Established 1900
WILSHIRE'S MAGAZINE
Published Monthly by
Wilshire Publishing Co.
115 Nassau Street.
New York City
GAYLORD WILSHIRE
Editor

Subscription 50 Cents per Year. Club of Eight 25c. per Year.

Wilshire Publishing Co. Incorporated under the Laws of the State of New York.

GAYLORD WILSHIRE.....President
S. M. WALLING.....Vice-President
WM. H. LEFFINGWELL.....Sec'y and Treas.
JOSHUA WANHOPE.....Managing Editor

Entered at the New York Post Office as second class matter.

Vol. XV JULY, 1911 No. 7

UNDOUBTEDLY the most significant occurrence of the past month concerning Socialism is the suggestion of Judge Gary at the Steel Trust investigation, to the effect that the Government should regulate the prices of steel products and generally supervise and control the industry. It had a most alarming effect on the local capitalist press, which correctly saw in it a distinct suggestion of "State Socialism." Gary, however, escaped denunciation, probably for the reason that those who were willing to denounce him could suggest no alternative.

This is the sort of "Socialism" which its enemies insist Socialists desire to bring about—slavery to the State, with the State as capitalist. It is this conception that is responsible for all the drivel that has been written and spoken about the "tyranny of Socialism."

What is remarkable about it, however, is that it is now suggested not by Socialists, but by capitalists. The incident, like a hundred other examples, merely goes to show that all the objectionable measures and things imputed to Socialists are in reality brought about by capitalists, or suggested by them, as in this case.

No Socialist paper or writer has acclaimed or even endorsed Gary's suggestion, a fact which is sufficient evidence that he has not suggested anything that Socialists want.

But they have explained the forces that compelled him to offer the suggestion, and these forces are driving society unerringly toward ultimate Socialism, of which the "State Socialism" of Gary is a necessary stage. Judge Gary may not and likely has not concerned himself with any Socialist theories on this subject, and probably has no conception that his suggestion has any relation thereto whatever. Practical business men of his type do not trouble themselves with theories or isms of any particular kind. They are individualists and opportunists incarnate.

What Gary proposes is a very different thing to the motto which this journal has adopted. WILSHIRE'S says, "Let the Nation own the Trusts." Judge Gary says, "let the government regulate the trusts and the capitalists own the government."

But none the less, it leads toward ultimate Socialism. To the millions who really imagine that the government as now constituted, represents the community, it will make the next step appear much simpler and easier. Capitalist government ownership actually changes nothing of the present relation between exploiters and exploited, but it simplifies the problem for the latter. They have but to take the government from the capitalists, and the industries go with it. And that is the one merit that "State Socialism" possesses.

It is a perception more or less clear, of this danger, that impels the capitalist press to view with alarm such a proposal as Gary's, and their alarm is justified.

When conditions develop to the point where other great capitalists of the Gary type see the necessity as he does, we are going to have his suggestion realized, despite all protests. What the Morgans and Rockefellers and Garys want will become a national want and will be represented as such. They have had their way in the past because of their possession of economic power, and they will have their way in the future, with still more certainty, seeing that their economic power is increasing, not diminishing.

What Socialists want or desire just now counts for little when their trifling power is considered. It is the capitalist's move, and as they move toward Socialism, we explain why and wherefore, and prepare the workers for the next move, when the capitalist class has reached its "State Socialist" limit.

IT is not so many years ago when most people, and especially Americans, looked for the comparatively quick and positively certain dissolution of the British Empire. Australia, it was promised, was to be a completely autonomous nation like the United States, while Canada could wish for no greater glory than to be admitted as one of the States under the starry flag of our grand country of liberty.

If the Coronation has done nothing else it certainly should have completed the awakening from this dream of the theorists, for if there was any one sentiment upon which all Britishers and Colonials were agreed, it was the necessity of making the present coalition of Great Britain with her Colonies a permanent one.

There was not one voice raised to suggest that there would be ever a time when any single Colony would think the time had arrived for it to make its own hive. All were devoted to the idea of a great union of free and equal autonomous states under one flag.

While it was recognized that there was no feeling of the right of the King to rule this Empire from any "divine right," it was equally recognized that pending some other plan there was nothing as simple to unite the different peoples of the Colonies and the Mother Country as the person of a King. Therefore the King was and is accepted as a political necessity, although paradoxically Royalty is felt to be an anachronism.

Of course sooner or later there must be formed a new body, the present British Parliament must have within it representatives from the Colonies. This is not as easy a solution of the difficulty of how the Colonies are to be represented as might be at first glance thought, because being represented in Parliament naturally diminishes the very thing now most jealously guarded, autonomy.

However, you can't have your cake and eat it too. Sooner or later the Colonies must surrender some of their autonomy in order to get the complete benefits of Imperial Federation.

I say "Imperial" because "Imperial" is the word now in use in this connection, but at the same time I know that the final federation will be fully democratic and be without either King or President.

We may have to wait for this however until we have the "Federation of Man."

Walter V. Osborne, the railroad porter who gained some notoriety recently in England by his action against the Amalgamated Railway Servants, which resulted in the famous "Osborne decision," has been given a position in the office of the British Constitution Association, a conservative institution. The decision forbade the use of Trade Union funds for political purposes, but is likely to be repealed shortly, owing to the fight being put up against it by the labor bodies of Great Britain.

The Coronation of King George V.

(*Continued from page* 1.)

The capitalists are recognizing the usefulness of a king to them and to their business. He gives stability and a center for them to rally about. A king also means a court, and a court means fashion. Therefore, the wives of the rich are especially strong supporters of a monarch. This is especially marked with the rich American women who are making Europe their home. A court gives them a chance to exhibit their wealth ostentatiously far better than a republic. It is well known that Paris has lost much of its vogue as a fashionable Mecca since the downfall of Louis Napoleon. At one time the rich American's heaven was Paris. Now it is London.

The second reason for a king exists in the method of working the parliamentary system with a responsible ministry.

In order to have a successful working of the system you must have a prime minister, responsible to and chosen by a king, a minister who can command a majority of parliament. When the king chooses a man who is the leader of the majority party it's a comparatively simple matter, but sometimes there is no majority party. In most of the parliaments of Europe there are more than two parties, and no single party has a clear majority. In France, as we know, there is often a rapid succession of prime ministers chosen by the president, who takes the place of a king, and it's a toss-up how many days the chosen one can command his majority made up from the different parties in the chamber. While he holds his majority, however, the prime minister is the autocrat of France and his creator, the president who has chosen him, being merely a figure-head. Inasmuch as it is recognised that there is necessity for a figure-head to do the choosing of the prime ministers it would seem that the general custom in Europe to have a hereditary man fill this office has advantages over putting into the place a more or less of a nonentity, as the French president is sure to be.

In England and the other countries too, for that matter, the prime minister appoints his cabinet ministers, and he and his cabinet constitute the real governors of the nation.

It is this feature of the parliamentary system with its natural tendency to a cabinet oligarchy which calls for maledictions from the Chestertons and Bellocs, But while I can see the force of their argument I must confess that I can see no other outcome for the parliamentary system except the incorporation of the initiative and referendum, and that does not seem to be a solution viewed with much favor by anyone in England outside of the Tory party. It is most probable, too, that the Tories will cool off in their ardor for the referendum as soon as the passage of the Home Rule Bill will prevent them from seeking the opinion of the country upon the only question that they oppose which would possibly not command a majority vote of the electorate.

Until England and the other parliamentary countries decide to adopt the initiative and referendum there is a necessity for some man outside of parliament selecting a prime minister, and it is probably about as simple to have this man, who will also act as the national figure-head, be a hereditary king as an elected president.

In the United States we have no responsible prime minister and the result is that we have our king and prime minister rolled into a Taft.

Therefore there are real reasons in Europe why, as things are as they are, the continued existence of kings and therefore the coronation of King George cannot be viewed as the last flicker of the candle by any means.

The people must have a figure-head to speak for them if they do not have the initiative and referendum. They must have a Taft or a king.

Let Australia Own Her Trusts

THE remarkable thing about the referendum vote in Australia upon the question of "Shall the Nation Own the Trusts" was not that two-thirds of the people voted against the proposal, but that one-third should have voted affirmatively.

There was little or no time for the education of the people upon such a very revolutionary proposal, and it is not surprising that they refused to endorse it on such short notice.

The labor leaders all are strongly of the opinion that when the proposal is again submitted that it will command a majority vote.

Once settled affirmatively and the Trusts taken over, then the question will be settled forever, for no one would ever dream of transferring them back again to the private owners.

We wonder when the American people will have a chance to a referendum vote upon the question of "Let the Nation Own the Trusts"?

Nationally Owned Telephones in England

HAVING tried private ownership of telephones for a long number of years and found it a failure, the British Government has decided to take the business over and run it as a branch of its Post Office department.

The transfer will be completed next December and involves the payment of something like $30,000,000 to the private companies, and the taking over by the State of the employment of over 18,000 operatives.

The United States is the only nation to-day that does not own and operate its own telegraph lines. It will soon be the only one that does not own its telephones.

Britain's Beer Trust

INCREASED taxation of the brewing industries of Great Britain, it is claimed, is necessitating centralization of the industry. The great firm of Allsopps, Limited, capitalized at an enormous sum, is now seeking combination with other brewing firms and has started by consolidating with the hardly less extensive concern of Ind, Coope & Co. Allsopps' chairman stated that this was but an initial step and when the combinations were complete the result would be the most enormous brewing concern England had ever known.

The New Cookery

"PAPER bag cooking" is the latest thing in the culinary line, and seems to be all the rage in England at present. Millions of specially prepared paper bags are being sold, and can be used either in boiling, baking, stewing, frying or roasting equally well. Food can also be steamed in them by the ordinary method of cooking. The bags are sold in various sizes from sixty cents to two dollars. The innovation will doubtless reach this country shortly.

The Value of National Health

WITH Mr. Lloyd George as spokesman and director, the tide of social and industrial reform in England is in full flood. In a remarkable address at Birmingham recently, the Chancellor of the Exchequer after declaring that the National Insurance Bill would be enacted into law within three months, went on to develop his ideas of future legislation. He summed up the problem as follows:

The evil in this and in every old country in the world is that they have, side by side with great and most extravagant wealth, multitudes of people who cannot consider even a bare subsistence as assured to them, meaning that minimum of food, raiment and shelter which is essential to keep human life in its tenement of clay at all.

The speaker then dealt with the subject of preventable illness, especially tuberculosis, which he declared carried off about eighty thousand people annually. He continued:

"As a rule, it is the worker who is attacked. As one man said: It rarely attacks a man who pays income tax. I do not suggest that as a remedy. But you have industries in Birmingham and in the surrounding district which are peculiarly liable to it—your brass working, some of your iron working. Go to Sheffield—your cutlery, file-making. These trades are peculiarly liable. Now, a man clings to his work as long as he can, because he knows if he gives it up there will be no one to provide for his family.

"What do we do in the Bill? We open a new prospect for that worker. We plant all over Britain cities of refuge to which we can flee from this avenger of life. We are setting a million and a half aside for the purpose of building sanatoria throughout the country. There will be a million for maintaining them. The worker now will be able to command medical attendance. He will discover the disease in time. He will be taken to these institutions in a few months. The bulk of the cases that are taken in time are cured. He will be restored to his health, restored to his workshop, a fit, capable citizen, instead of being a wreck.

"Now, that is one thing that we are doing. What next? We have a provision for maternity—an allowance of 30s., which, I think, is one of the most valuable provisions of the Bill, and we are going to see that the money is spent for the purpose for which it is designed, in spite of one or two protests we have had from friendly societies. The money is meant for the mother—to help her in discharging the sacred function of motherhood by proper treatment and fair play, so as to put an end to this disgraceful infantile mortality which we have got in this country.

"What else have we got? It is no use sending men to sanatoria, it is no use even giving them free doctoring, unless you relieve them from anxiety about their households. So we are making provision for the maintenance of the family during the time a man is under the doctor's hands, when he is fighting his struggle with the angel of death. We look after his children for him. Let him have both hands free to fight with the help of a doctor, and he will pull through.

"The allowance we are making is not a sumptuous one to begin with, but it will grow. It will grow without a single addition or charge upon employer or employed. One of the advantages of our scheme is that it will expand, it will fructify, it will bear more fruit. This is the beginning—and the beginning of a good deal more, before we have done. We are not done with fighting poverty and misery in this land.

These statements were interrupted with tremendous applause from the audience. The Chancellor, after again emphasizing the need of preserving the national health, then took up the subject of protection of property and contrasted the care and attention it received with the neglect of human life. He declared that in the future the latter would receive equal attention, and added that unsanitary property would not be permitted to menace the health of the community. On this subject he hit straight from the shoulder, and there was no mistaking his meaning. He declared:

"There is no city or town—nay, not a village—but you have got the reek of insanitary property. I want to see the law protecting property. Yes, but I also want to see it protecting the workers' home. I would treat the man who received rents or ground rents, from insanitary dwellings which kill little children, I would treat him as I would treat the receiver of stolen property. (Loud cheers.) They won't have very much to say in the future.

"Look at the minuteness with which the most insignificant property is protected. Take the game of the land. Why should not life and health be protected with the same ruthlessness, with the same remorselessness, with the same care? That ought to be our concern. If we are going to make this land greater than it is, if we are going to make it worthy of the splendid Empire of which it is the centre, if we are going to make it worthy of the position in the story of humanity which it ought to achieve, then the first thing we ought to do is to cleanse Britain of the foul habitations which spread corruption, disease and death in our great cities."

These declarations, so different in aggressiveness from the platitudes of the average reformer, were received with storms of cheers.

Before leaving the platform, the Chancellor let it be known plainly that all he had said was but a beginning—that there was much more to follow. "I never said," he concluded, "that this bill was a final solution. I am not putting it forward as a complete remedy. It is but one of a series we are advancing on the road, but it is an essential part of the journey."

Mr. George did not speak in detail of the final solution, but he said enough to give the impression that it would be found in Socialism alone.

One can imagine the alarm that would be raised if an American statesman as powerful and influential as Lloyd George delivered such an address on this side of the Atlantic. His denunciation as an open revolutionist and demagogue would follow as a matter of course.

And yet Lloyd George is very far from being a revolutionist, and certainly does not consider himself as such. His declarations are of the very essence of that "paternalism" which our capitalists presumably hold in utter abhorrence, and which they use continually as an accusation against Socialism. It is one of the ironies of our absurd industrial system that its upholders should now be driven by force of circumstances to inaugurate that very "paternalism" they have for decades denounced as the essence of Socialism. For it is certainly not the conscious, deliberately formulated demand of the British workers that is responsible for the Lloyd George proposals. On the contrary, Mr. George in all his public addresses plainly states that these measures are designed to help the helpless, he assumes that the workers have not sufficient sense to demand them or power enough to enforce their demand. In the very address from which the above extracts are taken, he emphasizes this position by comparing human beings to horses and machines. The latter he says are property, and are therefore recognized as valuable, and in consequence taken care of. The workers are quite as valuable, more so in fact, but the sense of ownership in them is not developed in the propertied classes, therefore they are neglected. He wants the change made on this showing, and plainly states that the workers are assets—property—like horses and machines, only really more valuable.

Nevertheless, his ideas are in accord with social progress, even if they ignore the initiative of the workers. That will certainly come later, and it is only fair to Mr. George to admit that when they are ready to put through the final solution, he will be with them. He is not advocating social revolution—possibly from the reform standpoint he is correct in not advocating it—but he certainly does not fear it, and explicitly says so.

Post Office Inquisition

WHEN a Socialist says that he is being persecuted by the post office and driven to Canada as I was ten years ago and interfered with in my private mining business to-day, nobody much believes him. However, when the post office commences to attack the big magazines and the agricultural press, then there appears to be something doing, as is instanced by the following editorial from Hearst's "American" of May 9th:

When the Post Office Department sought a law advancing postal rates on magazines it was something more than mere gossip that the motive was to punish the popular magazines for criticising the Administration, or to stifle such criticism by holding over all magazines a threat—like some suspended sword of Damocles. If that were the motive, investigation should discover it and Mr. Hitchcock be impeached.

The publishers and editors of our great magazines—names can be given—declare that while in Washington, laying before Congress their opposition and the reasons of it, to the Hitchcock programme, they were everywhere "shadowed" by departmental sleuths. They assert that their mails were plundered, their letters opened. If this be true, or any part of it be true, investigation should show it and some one be impeached. Such methods would disgrace a tyranny, heap infamy upon a despotism. To countenance them would be to stamp as failures both Yorktown and Bunker Hill. In that case we might better have remained an English province, since England would not support such scoundrelisms.

What follows came to the Post Office surface about a fortnight ago.

Mr. Myrick publishes an agricultural magazine. Last November it spoke harshly of the Administration and advised its readers to repudiate it. Mr. Myrick, through his weekly, urged the farmers to help elect a Democratic Congress.

Immediately thereafter Mr. Hitchcock's agents began poking about, in person and by letters, among Mr. Myrick's subscribers. Mr. Hitchcock's agents wound up their pryings and peerings, their pokings and sleuthings by reporting that Mr. Myrick's farm weekly was not a magazine, but a mere advertising vehicle. They recommended that it be refused place in the mails as second-class mail matter. It should be accepted—they said—only as third-class matter and pay first-class rates.

The Post Office Department, Mr. Hitchcock in command, was about to proceed in accordance with these findings and recommendations, when Mr. Myrick demanded a hearing. The hearing before Third Assistant Postmaster-General Britt was held on April 15th.

Mr. Myrick was present and sworn. He said that his magazine was seventy-five years old. If the magazine were third-class and not second-class matter, why had the Post Office authorities been so long blind and deaf and dumb to that important truth? asked Mr. Myrick.

On the question of his magazine being not a magazine, but a mere advertising medium, Mr. Myrick has this to say: His magazine devoted but 40 per cent. of its space to advertising. Other magazines, tamer and more tepid politically, with which Mr. Hitchcock found no fault, gave up to advertising as much as full 70 per cent. Why make fish of him and flesh of the others? asked Mr. Myrick.

The difference between first-class and second-class matter, Mr. Myrick explained, would be in his agricultural case a deadly difference. That postal difference would figure into a total of $18,000 a week. To exact it was to kill his publication—to annihilate it. Was it the Post Office purpose, Mr. Hitchcock at the head, to destroy Mr. Myrick's property? His magazine was worth hundreds of thousands of dollars. Was it to be struck down at one Post Office blow?

If so, why? asked Mr. Myrick.

It was here the unexpected came to pass. Ten Senators—no one knew why—had decided to be present at the hearing. At the query, Why has the Post Office Department taken the trail of Mr. Myrick's farm magazine? Senator Stone became inquisitive.

"Is it not a fact," asked Senator Stone of Mr. Myrick, "that you issued an extra edition on November 1st, which advised your million subscribers to vote the Democratic ticket? The edition was called the 'New Taft Tax in a New Form.' And isn't it a fact that you believed that in certain sections of the country this edition had the effect of returning Democratic Congressmen to seats that had been filled for years by Republicans?"

"Yes," replied Mr. Myrick.

"This Post Office investigation into your affairs was started shortly after that extra edition, was it not?"

Mr. Myrick replied in the affirmative.

"Do you think that the extra edition was the real cause that started the Post Office Department on your trail?"

"I would rather not answer that question," said Mr. Myrick.

And the cat was out of the bag.

Senator Lodge turned upon Assistant Postmaster-General Britt. Said Senator Lodge:

"What right has the Post Office Department to go prying into a man's affairs of this kind? Can you quote the statute from which they derive the authority?"

"It is a matter of postal regulations, and I do not know that it is founded on any statute," replied Mr. Britt.

At this Senator Gore broke in with: "Has this department re-established the ancient Inquisition? I had no idea that the inspectors were used as they have been in this case. One would think this man was a criminal instead of the editor of a magazine."

Mr. Britt, acting for Mr. Hitchcock and the Post Office Department, "reserved his decision." Congress, however, should not reserve its action. It should light the torch of inquiry and go into Post Office Department methods. If somebody is using the department as a party club, that somebody should be impeached. Also, the power to say what is and what is not second-class mail matter should be taken from the Postmaster-General and given to the courts.

Resting When the Work is Done—For Landlords Only

IS there anything remarkable in a man resting and eating after his work is done? No.

Is there anything more remarkable in the community doing so? No.

Is there anything more remarkable in *part* of the community doing so?

Most certainly there is, would be the reply of the London "Westminster Gazette," if one is to judge by the following note taken recently from its columns:

The agricultural laborers near Montpellier, in the South of France, have exacted the right to work from their employers. A few days ago they were informed by the farmers that for a space their labor would no longer be needed in the fields. The crops were growing beautifully under the warm sun, and all would be well, said the farmers, if they were left alone until the harvest. But the laborers wanted to work and maintained that they had a right to their wages. So they went into the fields every day as usual, and at the end of the week they demanded their wages—with threats. They were refused, until they began to carry out their threats of breaking everything they could lay hands on, and then the farmers seem to have paid up. A French paper suggests that if this demand for the right of work is once conceded it may have some startling results. The cabmen will force wayfarers into their cabs on the ground that they have a right to their fares; the publican will wait outside his inn and compel the passer-by to drink. The same journal draws an alarming picture of twelve domestics forcing their attentions on the poor householder, who will be compelled to give them work. A dozen motor-cars will wait on us in the morning to take us for a ride, that their chauffeurs may be employed, and half a dozen tailors will demand their right to cut half a dozen suits for us in the name of the law. We fancy that we have also heard of a Bill for the right to work in this country. We can't help feeling glad now that it did not pass into law. We had no idea at the time that Mr. Keir Hardie and Mr. Ramsay MacDonald had such dreadful ideas in their heads.

The point the "Westminster Gazette" does not notice is that what these men really wish is not to cultivate crops already well cultivated, but to gather in the reward for the cultivation that they have already done.

Is it not absurd to say to the peasants, "you have worked so hard and well that your work is finished, therefore you must starve to death because the crops are so abundant. If there is any resting and eating to be done, the landlord is quite able to do that job for the whole community"?

Democracy for British Empire

AT the recent "Council of Empire," held at the Foreign Office in London, Mr. Asquith, Premier of Great Britain, in his opening address made the following significant remarks as to the evolution of ideas regarding the policy of the Empire:

There are two things in the self-governing British Empire which are unique in the history of great political aggregations. The first is the reign of law: wherever the King's writ runs, it is the symbol and messenger not of an arbitrary authority, but of rights shared by every citizen, and capable of being asserted and made effective by the tribunals of the land. The second is the combination of local autonomy—absolute, unfettered, complete—with loyalty to a common head, co-operation, spontaneous and unforced, for common interests and purposes, and, I may add, a common trusteeship, whether it be in India or in the Crown Colonies, or in the Protectorates, or within our own borders, of the interests and fortunes of fellow subjects who have not yet attained, or perhaps in some cases may never attain, to the full stature of self-government.

These general considerations, gentlemen, familiar as they are to all of you, may not be wholly out of place when we are contemplating in advance the work which is set before this Imperial Conference. In the early Victorian era there were two rough and ready solutions for what was regarded, with some impatience, by the British statesmen of that day as the "Colonial problem." The one was centralization—the Government, that is, except in relatively trivial matters, of all the outlying parts of the Empire from an office in Downing Street. The other was disintegration, and the acquiescence in, perhaps the encouragement of, a process of successive "Hivings off," by which, without the hazards or embitterments of coercion, each community, as it grew to political manhood, would follow the example of the American Colonies, and start an independent and sovereign existence of its own. After seventy years' experience of Imperial evolution, it may be said with confidence that neither of these theories commands the faintest support to-day, either at home or in any part of our self-governing Empire.

Making all allowances for differences between theory and practice, this declaration of the Premier certainly points to an ever widening democracy in government, and leaves the way clear to unlimited peaceful change. Unhampered by an absurd Supreme Court and an antiquated constitution, as we are on this side, it is altogether likely that Great Britain and her colonies will finally achieve complete political and industrial democracy, with much less friction and rupture than we can make similar changes. In theory at any rate the British Premier is certainly progressive. He sees clearly enough that social coherence between peoples can only develop through the development of democracy, while on this side our government steadily becomes more autocratic and despotic. It certainly is one of the ironies of history to observe a monarchy and a republic thus headed in different directions.

THE "STREET CAR HOG."

(From *The Public*, Chicago, Ill.)

Every now and again the department of "Letters to the Editor" in some one or another of our newspapers blooms out with verbal assaults upon the "street car hog"; and occasionally the weary editorial writer, for want of a better subject, takes up the refrain. Who is it that they call "street car hog"? Not the man that sprawls over seats. Not the man who obstructs passageways. Not the man who elbows himself into a car already overcrowded. Not the man who pushes into cars ahead of women or weaker or older men than himself in order to grab a seat. The "street car hog" seems to be the man who, having paid for a seat (after waiting for it, possibly, while one crowded car after another went by), is discourteous enough to retain it, though women or his elders of his own sex who have come aboard after the seats are all taken, have to stand.

He *is* discourteous, of course. No one would do in a drawing room what he does in a street car. But then drawing room seats are not bought and sold. Where seats are bought and sold, the rule is a rule of property rather than one of courtesy. Is a man a "theatre hog" if he keeps the seat he has paid for while later comers stand? Is a man an "automobile hog" if he doesn't get out and walk in order to let some one without an automobile get in and ride? Is a man a "holiday hog" if he keeps the seat on the reviewing stand which he has paid for while older men and women of all ages stand on the curb? Certainly not. Then why is any man—or boy, for that matter—a "street car hog" because he doesn't politely give up the car seat he has paid for? It is his property for that ride as truly as if it were worth five dollars instead of five cents. If he gives up his property to another, just as matter of good feeling, we may applaud his generosity; but if he prefers to keep his property, who has any right to complain? Surely not the person who wants it.

True enough there is somewhere in this matter a responsibility to women and old men. But a little reflection will place the responsibility not upon owners of seats who refuse to give them away, but upon street car officials who do business on the Yerkes theory that "the money is in the straps." When the street car business is so conducted as to call upon seat owners to give up their property to other passengers every time they buy a seat, no one is a "hog" for keeping the seat he buys. If the street car business were fairly done, and the appeal to courtesy were occasional, we are sure that few persons would sit while weaker or older ones stood. The real "street car hog" is the manager who so conducts the street car business as to pack passengers, instead of seating them.

Where Canada Beats Us

ALL comparison between the economics of Canada and the United States, says A. J. Nock in the American Magazine, must be determined by four fundamental differences.

I. Canada has no Constitution.

II. Canada has no Supreme Court.

For these two great blessings, Mr. Maclean tells me, Canadians thank God daily—especially when they see how the progress of democracy is hampered in the United States. When a measure is enacted by the Canadian people in their Parliament, it goes into execution forthwith; whereas the acts of the United States Congress have to pass the scrutiny of nine gentlemen whose knowledge of law is profound and whose acquaintance with democracy (bar one—Justice Harlan) is extremely casual and uncertain. There is no such thing as "government by injunction" in the Dominion of Canada.

III. In Canada all the powers not expressly conferred upon the Provinces inhere in the Dominion Government at Ottawa.

In the United States it is the other way around. All the powers not expressly conferred upon the federal government at Washington reside in the several States.

The Canadians profited by our blunders, you see: Canada will never have to waste any blood or treasure over State sovereignty.

IV. Canada has a responsible Ministry.

Not a star-chamber like our Cabinet, a closed corporation, safe from scrutiny and question. The heads of departments in Canada are on the floor of the House, subject to interrogation by any member of the Parliament at any time, on any subject connected with their job. They have to answer too—that is what they are there for. The recent melancholy experience with the investigation of Mr. Ballinger shows how far Canada is ahead of us on this point. Imagine Mr. Ballinger at the outset of his secretaryship, with no kid-gloved partisan committee pecking at him daintily, but on the floor of the House, with the Insurgents and the Democrats pitching questions into him, day after day—Mr. Murdock, Mr. Saunders, Mr. Champ Clark—well, one just can't imagine it. Imagination recoils on itself at the attempt.

A Fowl Combination

The establishment of a $700,000 corporation, to be known as the Home and Foreign Poultry Farms, Limited, is reported from England and the Continent. Poultry farming in all its branches is to be operated and the concern promises to drive the little poultry farmer out of the business, which was always considered as peculiarly appropriate for the owners of petty rural capital, as thousands of articles advising the starting of small chicken farms attest. The new concern estimates its profits for the first year at over $200,000, and the business will be extended as rapidly as possible. The importation of poultry and eggs into England last year exceeded $40,000,000, and Germany imported in excess of $55,000,000, a fact the company points out in its prospectus as guaranteeing its future success. A large feather business is also provided for, and the little poultry raiser is now confronted with a competition that will bring out the best that is in him—and add it to the trust.

Book Review

WAR—WHAT FOR? By George R. Kirkpatrick. Cloth, 350 pp. $1.20 post paid. Published by the Author at West Lafayette, Ohio.

At last reports more than twenty thousand copies of this work had been sold, and the demand was steadily increasing. To our knowledge it is the first real anti-militarist work ever published in this country, and while it may not be the last, it looks as if the writers on this subject who come after Kirkpatrick will be working in a well-gleaned field. We have never seen so much information packed into 350 pages as this book contains, not hearsay or rumor, but reliable information from official sources. Kirkpatrick makes out his case against war from the admissions and statements of the upholders of and apologists for war.

And what a case it is! The material was gathered and arranged carefully and laboriously, and how it looks after presentation by the master hand of the author and compiler is simply beyond our power of description; we have seen many eulogistic reviews of this work, and can only say that the best of them fall far short of doing it justice. We do not like to use laudatory adjectives to excess, so will simply observe that it has never been our fortune to meet with such a powerful, vivid and irrefutable indictment of war and the system that causes it, in all our reading.

It has been said that the work is not "artistic," a remark which is undoubtedly true in the conventional acceptance of that term. But the merit of the work lies in its tremendous power and hideous reality of description. Were it "artistic" in the sense of the word as used by the ordinary book reviewer, its value would be largely destroyed.

The claim of the Russian painter of battle pictures, Verestchagin, to be considered an artist has been disputed, and in the same way Kirkpatrick may be denied that title. But Verestchagin painted war as it really is, and Kirkpatrick writes it as it really is, and therein lies the merit of both. And if hell can be depicted artistically, both have succeeded. Like the Russian's pictures, Kirkpatrick's book is horrifying, but invaluable. And there are millions who need exactly that sort of information presented in exactly that way. It is a commonplace saying that war is hell, but most people have to be taken by the heels and hung over the brink of the pit before they realize the actual sense of the expression; and that Kirkpatrick does.

The book is admirably suited to the needs of the "young person" of the male persuasion, who, with a head full of romantic notions of patriotism and the glory of war, feels inclined to offer himself for cannon fodder in the military or naval services, and who aspires to fall like a "soldier" on the field of battle wrapped in Stars and Stripes, union jacks and tricolors, etc., according to his preference in flags. Kirkpatrick shows such deluded youth that the fall in question is, not to put too fine a point upon it, a highly unpleasant experience and not at all up to the specifications required in romantic militarist literature.

Twenty thousand copies sold may be considered satisfactory enough until one reads the book. Then the need for ten times twenty thousand becomes apparent. And especially are there a hundred thousand young men in the military and naval service here who need Dr. Kirkpatrick's specific as a prophylactic much more than that now served out to them as a safeguard against sexual disease. For Kirkpatrick has rendered humanity a service in writing this work, and we confidently predict that it will not be forgotten until the curse it is aimed at has perished from the earth.

Books Received

THE SOCIALIST MOVEMENT. By J. Ramsay Macdonald, Chairman of the British Labor Party. Cloth, 252 pp. 75 cents net. Henry Holt and Co., Publishers, New York.

THE SOCIAL EVIL AND THE REMEDY. By J. H. Greer, M. D. Paper, 64 pp. 10 cents.

HOW CAPITALISM HAS HYPNOTIZED SOCIETY. By W. Thurston Brown. Paper, 30 pp. 10 cents.

THE ROSE DOOR. By Estelle Baker. Cloth, 202 pp., illus. $1.00. C. H. Kerr & Co., 118 W. Kinzie St., Chicago, Ill.

Tory Socialism

As illustrative of the movement in England toward the idea of its being the duty of the community to care for its members, the following from a recent speech by Mr. Balfour, the leader of the Tory Party, is interesting:

"There is no more hearty or genuine supporter of social reform in this country than I am myself. (Cheers.) While I acknowledge its extreme difficulties, while I recognize that hasty and ill-considered measures brought forward with the best intentions may sometimes do more harm than good, I yet hold firmly to the faith that in these days the idea that the Legislature and the Government are to stand aside from all social problems and leave these to work themselves out at their own sweet will, that those who hold that belong to a school which has long been exploded, which never was the school of the party to which I belong. It was indeed the school of the Radical Free Traders, and which even they have now abandoned, and which I do not think will ever again be professed or acted upon by any great party in the State."

Profits Will Accrue

The current belief that municipally conducted industries are unprofitable is completely exploded by the following table issued by the London County Council, detailing the returns from London municipalities in which electric undertakings were operated by the municipalities. The boroughs listed showed profits in Pounds sterling for the year 1909-10 as tabled below:

Battersea	£7,733
Bermondsey	1,205
Fulham	5,621
Hackney	2,243
Hammersmith	6,582
Hampstead	1,031
Poplar	7,653
Marylebone	36,087
St. Pancras	3,173
Shoreditch	2,078
Southwark	718
Stepney	4,816
Stoke Newington	417

Only in one municipality was there a loss on municipally supplied electric power, the borough of Woolwich showing a loss of £4,798. The total number of electric units supplied through these municipalities for the year amounted to 75,115,968.

The real objection to municipal undertakings lies in the fact that the profits do not go into the hands of private individuals, but into those of the community, so the falsehood is invented that there are no profits whatever.

From a Socialist Visitor to Bishop

1789 Third St., San Diego, Cal.
June 4th, 1911.

Mr. Gaylord Wilshire, London England.

Dear Mr. Wilshire:—I arrived at Bishop May 9th, and after an interview with Mr. Lodge I called on a number of prominent business men, including some of wide experience who had visited the mine and taken samples of the ore from different levels and had them assayed by competent and reliable assayers, and, in every instance, they verified all statements made by Mr. Lodge on the values and approximate cost of extraction of the bullion from the ore.

A few days after I reached Bishop, Mr. Lodge took me up to the mine, thus furnishing me with an opportunity to see with my own eyes the buildings, machinery and other equipment. I found that the buildings were commodious and well put up, and the machinery the very best that could be obtained for the requirements connected with the development of the property. Practical miners afterward told me that, so far, it had been the best managed mining property in Inyo County.

I am well pleased to inform you that I am perfectly satisfied with my investment, and believe that ultimately you will prove to the world that when you stated that Bishop Creek Mine was the World's greatest gold mine, you were not exaggerating in any sense of the word. With best wishes for your future success, I am,

Yours truly,
F. W. TAYLOR.

P. S.—You are at perfect liberty to publish this report, if you feel that it will be of any use to you. F. T.

A Menacing Military Chant

Paris *Figaro* of recent date contains a significant item on the tendency to revolution existing in the French army. It says:

"A dispatch from Dijon relates a deplorable incident which occurred during the recent night march executed by the 57th territorial regiment.

"A halt was ordered during the night and as it was prolonged for more than an hour and the weather was very cold, discontent at once manifested itself among the men. It began with murmuring and finally the murmuring was transformed into the revolutionary chant of the *Internationale.*

"The officers, says the dispatch, intervened immediately. But was it to impose silence upon the malcontents? No. But they calmed them by giving them permission to go on singing.

"Those who conduct themselves in this manner are surely demented. The *Internationale* is rightly considered the most dangerous of songs to be allowed in the army. This conduct, however, accustoms the soldiers to regard it a perfectly appropriate, especially when encouraged in this manner."

The *Internationale,* it may be explained, is the national Socialist song of France and has, to a large extent, displaced the "Marseillaise" as a revolutionary anthem. Its stanzas contain passages urging in the most plain words the direct physical overthrow of the capitalist régime. It is not strange, therefore, that *Figaro* should take the alarm over such an incident. Possibly the officers decided that it was impossible to suppress its singing on this occasion or, worse still, may have actually been in sympathy with it.

SUMMER SUPPLIES FOR SOCIALISTS

We Are Offering at Reduced Prices for the Summer Season the Famous Specialties, for Which the WILSHIRE BOOK COMPANY is Noted:

KARL MARX PINS. These beautiful and artistic emblems are an exact reproduction of the pin worn by Marx and presented by him to his friend, Frederick Engels. The design is the red flag, beautifully enamelled. For years it has been a favorite with American Socialists.

Every one who sees one of these handsome pins wants one, but many as yet do not know how to obtain them. We offer the following special inducement to make these pins known to your friends and comrades:

To any one sending an order for five, we shall not only make the rate of five for one dollar, but will present the sender with an extra pin, free of charge. You can easily induce your friends to make up a club of five.

SOCIALIST PILLOW TOPS. Two Mottoes—"Socialism, The Hope of the World," and "Let the Nation Own the Trusts." Beautiful designs stamped in colors. Fascinating embroidery work for women comrades. An attractive item for Socialist fairs, etc. Size 20x22 inches. Reduced to 25 cents each.

Now that the MacNamara case recalls the famous Moyer-Haywood trial of five years ago, it has caused a brisk demand for Friedman's exposure published by us at the time—**THE PINKERTON LABOR SPY.** Copies of this famous work, beautifully and substantially bound in cloth, 50 cents each.

We have yet on hand a few hundred copies of the late Comrade Hanford's splendid propaganda work, **"FIGHT FOR YOUR LIFE."** Strongly bound in paper covers, with portrait of Hanford. Single copies, 15 cents; ten copies, one dollar. A most appropriate volume at this time when Labor is literally forced to "Fight for Its Life."

LANTERN SLIDES FOR STEREOPTICON VIEWS

Thirty-one slides illustrating the well-known lantern lecture on **"THE DIVISION OF WEALTH."** By Jos. Wanhope. $8.00.

These slides have had a phenomenal popularity and have been used with great effect throughout various parts of the country by Socialist lecturers. Text book accompanies the slides.

Portrait lantern slides of Karl Marx, Wilhelm Liebknecht, Eugene V. Debs, William D. Haywood, Chas. H. Moyer and M. Tschaikowsky, the great Russian revolutionist, 50 cents each. For $2.00 these portrait slides will be added to the thirty-one in the above-mentioned lantern lecture, making the total $10.00. They can be interpolated in the lecture with good effect.

We also carry a full and complete line of Socialist pamphlets, leaflets and the cheaper kinds of propaganda literature at the lowest possible prices. We can supply practically every work on Socialism written in the English language and still in print.

WILSHIRE BOOK COMPANY

113 East 26th Street, New York

"The Clearing-House for All Socialist Literature"